

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 13-16 remain pending in the present application as amended. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include the subject matter of claims 7 and 18, respectively, and such claims 7 and 18 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment After Final should enter inasmuch as the Amendment raises no new issues, should require no further searching, and is expected to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Skyrme (“Full Product Review Adobe Live Motion”). Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 102 rejection insofar as it may be applied to the claims as amended.

Preliminarily, Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has ascribed the Skyrme reference with a publication date of December 12, 2002 in a List of References Cited by Examiner dated July 31, 2006. However, Applicants have thoroughly reviewed such Skyrme reference and cannot find any confirmation therein that would support such a publication date. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that no publication date can be found within the Skyrme reference, and therefore respectfully submit that without such a publication date the Examiner cannot say with any certainty that such Skyrme reference is in fact available as prior art under Section 102 against the present application. Thus, Applicants must respectfully conclude that the Skyrme reference cannot be employed in connection with a Section 102 rejection to anticipate the claims of the present application, and for this reason alone the Section 102 rejection should be withdrawn.

At any rate, Applicants also respectfully note that the Skyrme reference does not actually disclose the LiveMotion product discussed therein, but instead merely reviews such product. That is, the Skyrme reference only discloses the author’s perception of the LiveMotion product, but does not disclose with any certainty the LiveMotion product itself. Applicants respectfully submit, then, that the Skyrme reference can only be cited to regarding the author’s perception of the LiveMotion product and that such perceptions are not at all relevant to what the LiveMotion product does and how such LiveMotion product actually

functions. In fact, the author's perception of such product is in effect rumor or hearsay that is not factual or even verifiable and could in fact be wrong. For this reason too, then, Applicants must respectfully conclude that the Skyrme reference cannot be employed in connection with a Section 102 rejection to anticipate the claims of the present application, and for this reason too the Section 102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Still at any rate, Applicants respectfully note that independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of now-cancelled claim 7, and independent claim 13 has likewise been amended to incorporate the features of now-cancelled claim 18. Thus, independent claim 1 as amended recites a method of keyframing an object implemented at least in part by a computer, where at least one property and a time for the object are identified, and a first compound key frame is created at the time. A second time is then created for the object, as is a second compound key frame at the second time, but a change to the at least one property is received prior to creating the second compound key frame. Thus, the second compound key frame incorporates the change to the at least one property.

As amended, claim 1 also recites that, responsive to the received change to the at least one property, an attribute key frame is created if no attribute key frame exists for the at least one property at the time the received change is received, or an existing attribute key frame is changed if the existing attribute key frame exists at the time the received change is received.

Independent claim 13 as amended recites subject matter similar to that of claim 1 as amended, albeit as a computer system performing a method.

Applicants respectfully submit that the author's perception of the LiveMotion product as set forth in the Skyrme reference clearly does not disclose or even appreciate the distinction between an attribute key frame and a compound key frame, as is set forth in claims 1 and 13. As set forth in the specification of the present application at paragraph 0008, an attribute key frame is a key frame at the attribute level and a compound key frame is a key frame at the object level. A compound key frame can be thought of as essentially a placeholder for a "virtual attribute key frame" on all possible attributes. Other attribute key frames force this virtual attribute key frame to manifest itself on those attributes. At any rate, inasmuch as the author's perception of the LiveMotion product as set forth in the Skyrme reference clearly does not disclose or even appreciate the distinction between an attribute key

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3488 / 307555.01
Application No.: 10/825,035
Office Action Dated: April 17, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

frame and a compound key frame, as is set forth in claims 1 and 13, the Skyrme reference cannot be employed to anticipate such claims 1 and 13 as amended.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the author's perception of the LiveMotion product as set forth in the Skyrme reference clearly does not disclose or even appreciate that, responsive to the received change to the at least one property, an attribute key frame is created if no attribute key frame exists for the at least one property at the time the received change is received, or an existing attribute key frame is changed if the existing attribute key frame exists at the time the received change is received, as is required by claims 1 and 13. For this reason too, the Skyrme reference cannot be employed to anticipate such claims 1 and 13 as amended.

Thus, for all of the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Skyrme reference does not anticipate claims 1 or 13 or any claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-5 and 14-16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection.

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application including claims 1-5 and 13-16 is in condition for Allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 17, 2007

/Joseph R. Condo/
Joseph R. Condo
Registration No. 42,431

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439